

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action, claims 26-27, 29, 31, 32, 34-38, 40-41, and 52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Dube et al. (U.S. Publ. No. 2002/0056668 with citations to U.S. Pat. No. 6,843,376). Claims 28, 33, 39 and 42-51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dube et al. in view of Mclean (U.S. Pat. No. 2,055,630), Davis (U.S. Pat. No. 6,318,560), and Paladin (U.S. Pat. No. 6,986,425).

Dube et al. actually shows in Figures 1 to 8 a drum screen machine that comprises a disc screen. The reference M in Figure 2, however, does not allow the deduction that a common drive for the drum screen and the disc screen is disclosed. The impression is rather that this drive is only the drive for the conveying device. The description does not give any information in that respect. The Examiner did not give a source or reference in that respect either.

The Examiner refers to the feeding hopper using reference number 45. The feeding hopper, however, actually bears the reference number 35 (see column 5, lines 33 or 50). The reference number 45 refers to a transition conveyer. The disc screen and drum screen are two separate screen devices as shown in Figures 1 and 2 of the Dube et al. patent. Unlike the solution shown by the present application, in Dube et al., the first disc screen is located above the transition conveyor which conveys the material to the drum screen. The solution of the

present invention shows the feeding hopper to be located above the drum screen machine or rather above a part of the drum and the disc screen screens the oversized particles before the material is fed into the feeding hopper. This is a different concept which is characterized by a very compact, short design of the present invention.

It remains unexplained, for example, how the common drive of Dube et al. can work as a direct drive of the drum screen machine, since this alleged drive, referenced with M, cannot drive the drum screen directly. It would need a transformation for that. Also, the feature disclosed in claim 33 is not disclosed by Dube, i.e. an adjusting device by means of which the angle between disc screen and feeding hopper is adjustable. The solution by Dube et al. is characterized by the fact that the angle of the disc screens, located on the transport device, is predetermined by the angle of the transport device and the height of the second disc screen. Therefore, even the drawing does not show adjustability. It cannot be found in the description either.

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application should now be in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is in order, and such favorable action and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

However, if after reviewing the above amendments and remarks, the Examiner has any questions or comments, he is cordially invited to contact the undersigned attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

JACOBSON HOLMAN PLLC

By:   
John C. Holman  
Reg. No. 22,769

400 Seventh Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004-2201  
(202) 638-6666  
Date: April 21, 2009  
JCH/JLS:ms